

E. 01345A-08-0172

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM



0000091953

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSIC

ORIGINAL

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2008 73919

Date: 12/15/2008

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable

First:

Last:

Complaint By:

Mike

Ruppert

Account Name:

Mike Ruppert

Home: [REDACTED]

Street:

[REDACTED]

Work:

City:

Phoenix

CBR:

State:

AZ Zip: 85009

is:

Utility Company:

Arizona Public Service Company

Division:

Electric

Contact Name:

[REDACTED]

Contact Phone:

[REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

12/12 ***** Docket No. E-01345A-08-0172 *****

Customer is opposed to any increase to the proposed rate application. He believes the Commission should not have given the company the previous rate hike.

He feels the oprn meeting rules need to be amended. He feels the pace of the meeting was ridiculous and there was no need to take up the time for each side to answer what was meant by this statement or that statement. He believes the people are being penalized and the rates are not fair.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Advised customer his comments would be docketed. A complaint was filed with other concerns on his behalf.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/15/2008

Opinion No. 2008 - 73919

12-11-08 11:00 AM

08/13/08

E. 01345A.08.0172

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion **No.** 2008 73890

Date: 12/12/2008

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
 N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: **First:** **Last:**
 Donald **Holmes**

Account Name: Donald Holmes

Home: (000) 000-0000

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Sun City West

CBR: [REDACTED]

State: AZ **Zip:** 85375

is:

Utility Company: **Arizona Public Service Company**

Division: Electric

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

11/15/05 DOCKET NO E 01345A-08-0172 EMAIL RECEIVED TROUGH CHAIRMAN GLEASON'S OFFICE
11/18/08 AND SENT TO COMPANY FOR RESPONSE. SEE COMPLAINT NO 73097

11/17

From: Don H [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2008 11:02 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: APS Rates & Billing Practices

Dear Commissioner Gleason:

APS billing practices are very suspect, and provide APS cash flows contrary to commission approved rate structures. My "averaged" Equalizer billing for my Sun City West home illustrates this APS deceptive practice. My original "averaged" Equalizer monthly billing commencing 2004 was \$109.00 a month, \$1308.00 a year; at the end of the year there was \$482.00 credit to my APS account, essentially money of mine APS used interest free. After repeated surpluses to my account, and my complaints to APS, my "averaged" Equalizer monthly payment was reduced to \$92.00 a month, \$1104.00 a year, generating a year end credit (rate adjusted for commission approved increases) of \$197.00, again APS used but paid no interest on this amount.

By coincidence, around the same time APS submitted a rate increase request to your Commission, I received a letter from APS notifying me monthly Equalizer payment would be increased by APS from \$92.00 a month to \$165.00 a month effective November, 2008. Bottom line, APS has contrived a "work-a-round" to any rate actions the Arizona Corporation Commission may take, to insure APS projected cash flow requirements, regardless of individual account usage, or Commission approved rates.

This deceptive, bordering on fraudulent, APS practice, may, within the Commissions

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

capacity, be difficult to eliminate, BUT the Commission does have the authority to require APS to pay 12% interest on all amounts collected from power consumers in excess of actual usage.

I urge to Commision to adopt a rule requiring APS and other power companies within your jurisdiction to pay 12% interest to the consumer customer on all amounts billed and collected vis-a-vis "averaging" and/or Equalizer accounts that exceed actual usage at rates approved by the ACC.

Respectfully,

Donald Holmes

Sun City West, AZ 85375

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Email to customer advising his coments would be docketed.

December 10, 2008

Dear Mr. Holmes,

Your emailed comments relating to Arizona Public Service Company's ("APS") explanation of the Equalizer process have been received through the office of Chairman Gleason.

Pursuant to the Arizona Administrative Code R14-2-210.G.1 "a utility may, at its option, offer its customers a levelized billing plan."

This levelized billing plan is a voluntary payment option.

I have attached a copy of the Arizona Administrative Code rules.

Your comments urging the Commission to adopt a rule requiring utilities to pay 12% interest on amounts received on customer accounts that exceed actual usage at rates approved by the Arizona Corporation Commission will be docketed and made a part of the APS pending application.

Thank you for your comments and the interest taken in the decision process of the Arizona Corporation Commission.

Sincerely,

Trish Meeter

End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/12/2008

Opinion No. 2008 - 73890

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton**Phone:** [REDACTED]**Fax:** [REDACTED]**Priority:** Respond Within Five Days**Opinion** **No. 2008 - 74014****Date:** 12/17/2008**Complaint Description:** 08E Rate Cases Items - In Favor
N/A Not Applicable**Complaint By:** **First:** **Last:**
Mary Dillon**Account Name:** Mary Dillon**Home:** (480) 000-0000**Street:** [REDACTED]**Work:** [REDACTED]**City:** Phoenix**CBR:****State:** AZ **Zip:** 85028**is:****Utility Company:** Arizona Public Service Company**Division:** Electric**Contact Name:** [REDACTED]**Contact Phone:** [REDACTED]**Nature of Complaint:**

Docket No. E 01345A-08-0172

Please seriously consider approving the rate increase requested that is currently in front of you.

Without the increase our community and State will take years to recover financially as well as environmentally.

We could seriously have BLACK OUTS in our state should APS not have the resources available to invest into the future growth of our State by maintaining and adding transmission lines and other infrastructure required to run a successful utility.

APS cannot be compared to SRP, as they are not governed or taxed the same as SRP.

APS has already stated they will have no resources available to invest in Solar or other green and cost saving methods to produce electricity if this is not approved.

As elected officials, please, please if we do not pay now, we will certainly pay later. \$4 per month, per household vs \$30 per month at a later date. Should APS be required to cut back further, many small businesses in the State that supply infrastructure and utility products will also be affected.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

Called customer and confirmed receipt of opinion.

End of Comments